2: Hudson E-4, 5 (1936) 1938 RQ2 Kazak RQ2

593 woman but agreed that this position varied considerably from family to family. There were
562 examples of hen-pecked husbands dominated by their wives, but these were looked upon with a mixture of disdain and amusement by the community.

[841] According to Mohammedan custom women are considered unclean at the time of menstruation, but the Kazak woman seems to have been little affected by this view because she could not be spared from the work around the camp to perform the proper ablutions, prayers and fasts.[21]

595 When circumstances made it possible for each wife to have her own kibitka she brought
● 855 up her children more or less separately from those of other wives. When there were two or
[601] more wives living in one kibitka maternal authority tended to become somewhat confused but under the general supervision of the senior wife. Children applied to other wives of their father the same term (cece) which they used for their own mother or, if it was necessary to distinguish, added a descriptive term: egej cece (stepmother). The several wives likewise referred to any of their husband's children as ul (son) or qɪz (daughter). As the children passed out of the infancy stage boys were brought up by the father, while the
852 girls were trained by their mothers.[22] Boys were circumcised at any time from three to twelve years of age by a mullah (Mohammedan priest). For this occasion parents were expected to give a feast. Levshin notes[23] that this ceremony was much more strictly observed than any other of the obligations laid down by Islamic law.

884 There were no ceremonial observances at puberty or coming of age, nor was there any fixed age at which a youth was considered to have obtained his majority. According to Grodekov's information[24] it might be anywhere from the twelfth to the fifteenth year, depending on the precocity of the individual. Inasmuch as the sign and symbol of having attained majority was to be master of one's own kibitka it also depended on the affluence of the parents, since the rich could afford to set up their sons at an earlier age. Girls could hardly be said to have ever come of age since a woman was "only half a man," but their marriage might be considered, in this respect, as equivalent to the son's obtaining his own
[582] kibitka. The marriage of a girl might take place at any time from about nine years of age on.
597 Children were frequently adopted. This might be because their own parents had died and they would be taken in by relatives of the latter, usually by their father's brother. Or a childless family would adopt a son from one that had several, preferably also from among close relatives. Grodekov[25] further mentions reciprocal exchange of children between two families. I did not obtain any information on this point.

Adoption took place before witnesses and was symbolized by the child touching the breast of his foster mother, indicating that she considered him as her own. Such adopted

[21] See also Rudenko, *Ocherk Byta . . . Kazakov*, 49.
[22] See also Grodekov, *Kirgizy i Karakirgizy*, 33.
[23] *Description des hordes*, 356–57.
[24] *Op. cit.*, 36.
[25] *Kirgizy i Karakirgizy*, 37; see also Dingelstedt, *Le Droit coutumier*, 252–53.

In former times the slaves also formed a numerous group of permanent residents among the uru members, except for such of them as might be ransomed or freed for other reasons. Their children would also be slaves of the same owners. Here, in a slightly different status, must be included the slaves and maid-servants who formed part of the dowries of wealthy brides. In the unlikely event of their mistress being sent back to her parents they would perhaps return with her.

In a quite different economic class were individuals who, while not blood members of the group, might own and occupy land for fodder and winter quarters among them.[3] They were mostly rather wealthy cattle owners who were obliged to supplement their hay-fields and to find better or more extensive winter shelter for their herds. In some, and perhaps in most, cases they were related to the uru members through the female line.[4]

Children might be brought up by the mother's group. Grodekov[5] writes:

> Children enjoy protection from the mother's tribe when the father's is inactive or absent. In that case when the father is of the tribe of, say, Chumekei, and the child is educated by the mother's tribe, Dzhappac, he is called among them Dzhappac [compare Rudenko's statement above] to avoid coldness of relations . . . [but] no one may belong to his mother's tribe.

Grodekov further indicates that a group may have a legal claim on daughters of its female members by birth:

> If a father dies without relatives, the children go to the mother's tribe. The son may choose whether to go or not, and may take up a trade but the girl is obliged to go since they claim her by law.

There is no further light on this point. It seems contradictory to other information.

There might be children other than those whose mothers had belonged to the group adopted by families within it. Usually, however, adopted children were taken from a brother's family, and therefore were by birth uru members. I have no satisfactory information on whether or not they would be considered as uru members if born outside but formally adopted into it.

A wife's kinsmen might in some cases come and live with her in her husband's group. Grodekov says[6] that a widower may go to live with his married daughter, but only with the permission of his son-in-law. One of my informants remarked that if a girl married well into a rich family her own kinsmen might be expected to spend a large part of their time visiting her.

In enumerating the foreign elements resident among the uru group there must also be included the free-lance warriors and the Telengut who served the powerful local chiefs and khans.

All the categories mentioned above were more or less permanently attached to the

[3] See also Grodekov, *Kirgizy i Karakirgizy*, 15.
[4] Grodekov, *Kirgizy i Karakirgizy*, 15, 37; Dingelstedt, *Le Droit coutumier*, 214.
[5] *Op. cit.*, 37.
[6] *Kirgizy i Karakirgizy*, 35.

527 or a sultan. Here the right to preeminance is
554 decided either by the seniority of the clan, or by the importance of the family if it is a sultan. The person who is given this position of seniority is treated with the greatest respect. This is expressed, among other ways, in the fact that during the feast the cup of meat which is brought to him contains the head of the slaughtered animal.

During these banquets the persons of honor, as a sign of special graciousness, feed a younger brother with their own hands with pieces of meat and fat, placing the food unceremoniously in the mouth of the lucky fellow considered worthy of such an honor, while he usually crawls up to them on his knees. During this time beggars and servants usually wait for the end of the banquet, standing or sitting behind the feasters, and from time to time the honored guests throw them pieces of meat and bones. Afterwards the remains of the banquet belong to this hungry brotherhood and to the women.

855 The rearing of children among the Kazakhs is crude and perfunctory. Neither father nor mother bothers about them particularly. Usually the children up to the age of 12 or 13 run about in the summer naked or practically naked, in some kind of a rag. In the winter because of of the cold they often hide among the sheep, which are allowed into the tent, and there only their half-shaven, half-shorn heads pop up among the rams and gaze with wild, sharp eyes at the
578 newly arrived visitor. Like all primitive creatures, the Kazakhs do not hesitate to use expressions rising to the highest degree of cynicism when they quarrel. But the head of the family only rarely beats the other members.